11/26/67

If your paper does not carry Book World and you want a copy of Epstein's review of Sylvia's book, let ke know. It is a page one memorial to Epsrein's classic ignorance, a consignment of Sylvia's fine work to history only-almost an appeal for it-and a further effort to freeze the opic in the hold of the past.

My impression is that the content of the review will sell copies only to libraries, while the prominence may help Sylvia.

How casual Epstein is about his own ignorance, how careless in its display. For example, he pretends he is addressing the backward movement of the head by saying it could have been caused by acceleration of the car. However, it was not until later that the car accelerated, as casual acquaintance with the essential, the most fundamental facts, shows.

Ah, our scholars! Thank God for the intellectuals!

Sylvia is bracketed with Robert, who emerges from Jean Stafford's sycophantic typewriter as human and kindly. How else to evaluate a man and what bears his name when you have written as the widow of the now-revolving A.J.Liebeling wrote? How else to ennoble manhood which for profit defames motherhood and mother?

Here also we have a reflection of the press attitude that makes me think more and more about the Thompson book, its purpose and what might be done with it. We have both sides: Only what has been written from the printed evidence is to be noted on the one side, meaning everyone is to think as the coordinated whitewashes, which reached the largest audience of all, conditioned the uninformed to think, while the only sign of anything new is the "solution" that gets the government off the petard on which it hoist itself.

Despite her present, Sylvia's past deserves the space she got. I know, withoit having had time to read it, that her books deserves better than Epstein gave it.

Yet it is, unfortunately, true that her work is dated, is part of the past. I fear the same thing for yours, which is one of the reasons I carried with me those bulky files, so you could see some of the new material and decide whether you'd like to include some. On the New Orleans end, Paul Hoch copied most of the documents. They were in a blue portfolio that perhaps you didn't see at all. They are, presently, less important than those you did look through.

We must find some way of letting the people know that there is an abundance of evidence that is not in the 26 volumes. Maybe I insulted the SEPost enough for them to stop and think, if they did not consciously do what they did. Perhaps, with their editorial, they may go a step further.

Best,